United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/673,728	02/12/2007	Karl Scheller	ALLEG-041AUS	3293
22494 7590 09/19/2007 DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP SUITE 301A 354A TURNPIKE STREET CANTON, MA 02021-2714			EXAMINER	
			WHITTINGTON, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2862	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		SCHELLER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	11/673,728				
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Kenneth J. Whittington pears on the cover sheet with	2862 of the correspondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the second status of the se	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 36(a). In no event, however, may a repwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. All by be timely filed All from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2007. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims	•				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are pending in the applitude 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3 and 11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4-10 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2007 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	e: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square old drawing(s) be held in abeyanction is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		/Mail Date ormal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

The Amendment and Remarks thereto filed August 16, 2007 have been entered and considered.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3 and 11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 7199579, hereinafter '579. Although the conflicting claims are not

Page 3

Art Unit: 2862

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are merely broader recitations in method form of the same claims.

Regarding claim 1, '579 recites a detecting a ferrous article comprising: generating a magnetic field signal indicative of an ambient magnetic field (See claim 2 as a whole, which includes claim 1);

generating a tracking signal which substantially follows at least a portion of said magnetic field signal (See claim 2 as a whole, which includes claim 1);

generating a too-far-behind signal which changes state when said magnetic field signal varies from said tracking signal by a predetermined amount; and changing step size of said tracking signal in response to transitions of said too-far-behind signal (See claim 2 as a whole, which includes claim 1); and

generating a first output signal having a first step size with a first digital-to-analog converter, generating a second output signal having a second step size larger than said first step size with a second digital-to-analog converter and summing said first and said second output signals to provide said tracking signal (See claim 2 as a whole, which includes claim 1).

Regarding claim 3, '579 recites said changing step size comprises: counting with a first counter for providing a first count signal to said first digital-to-analog converter; and counting with a second counter for providing a second count signal to said second digital-to-analog converter, wherein in response to a first state of said too-far-behind signal said second counter is stepped in association with a terminal count of said first counter, and in response to a second state of said too-far-behind signal said second counter is also stepped (See claim 4 as a whole, which includes claims 1-3).

Regarding claim 11, '579 recites controlling said tracking signal to include steps associated with the first step size when said magnetic field varies from said tracking signal by less than the predetermined amount and to include larger steps associated with the second step size when said magnetic field varies from said tracking signal by more than a predetermined amount (See claim 2 as a whole, which includes claim 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 4-7, the prior art does not show or teach a POSCOMP signal in combination with a first and second digital-to-analog converters having different step sizes as recited in the claims and in combination with the other features of the claims.

Regarding claims 8-10, the prior art does not show the first and second counters as recited in the claims and in combination with the other features of the claims.

It is also noted that all claims would also be allowable if a proper Terminal Disclaimer were filed to overcome the Double Patenting rejections noted above. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: regarding these claims, the prior art does not show or teach a first and second digital-to-analog converters having different step sizes as recited in the claims and in combination with the other features of the claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 16, 2007 with respect to the Double Patenting rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the only remaining rejections, i.e., the Double Patenting, Applicants have asserted that the prohibition

contained in 35 USC 121 prevents the rejection noted above and have pointed to MPEP 804.01 for support.

Page 6

While such a statement is accurate in certain instances, such prohibition does not apply if the claims in the issued Patent and/or the divisional application are no longer consonant with the claims restricted that were the subject of the Restriction Requirement, i.e., the claims were changed in material respects and/or the line of demarcation no longer exists. See MPEP804.01(B).

In the instant case, the evidence claims of each group in the Restriction Requirement made on March 21, 2006 no longer exist. Applicants' amendments to the claims in both the parent and the present application have rendered the claims no longer consonant with the originally restricted claims and the lines of demarcation no longer exist. Thus, the prohibition under 35 USC 121 does not apply and the Double Patenting rejections stand.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS**ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth J. Whittington whose telephone number is (571) 272-2264. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30am-

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Assouad can be reached on (571) 272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 11/673,728 Page 8

Art Unit: 2862

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kenneth J Whittington

Examiner

Art Unit 2862

kjw

REENA AURORA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800